Application No. Applicant(s) 10/521.624 IGARASHI ET AL. Interview Summary Examiner Art Unit ΜΔΠΗΙΙ ΚΗΔΝΝΔ 2451 All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel): (1) MADHU KHANNA. (3) (2) PAUL GURZO. (4)____. Date of Interview: 05 December 2008. Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference c) Personal (copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No. If Yes, brief description: Claim(s) discussed: 1.2.6.7 and 11. Identification of prior art discussed: N/A. Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A. Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: It was agreed that independent claims 1, 6 and 11 would be issued as allowable if amended to include the limitations of dependent claims 2 and 7 and if "the condition" was amended to "a condition" to fix antecedent basis problem. Applicant gave Examiner permission to make the above mentioned Examiner's Amendments (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.) THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet. /Madhu Khanna/ Examiner, Art Unit 2451